

To: Johnson, Kathleen[Johnson.Kathleen@epa.gov]
Cc: Hagler, Tom[Hagler.Tom@epa.gov]; Vendlinski, Tim[vendlinski.tim@epa.gov];
Foresman, Erin[Foresman.Erin@epa.gov]
From: Goforth, Kathleen
Sent: Thur 9/25/2014 5:46:49 PM
Subject: BDCP Sacto mtg notes

Kathleen -

I just re-read your 9/19 BDCP Sacto meeting notes email and compared it to my notes from the meeting. I, too heard no specific technical disagreements -- just a lot of "we can explain that better" and "you're right, we didn't analyze that". The only time I noted anyone saying that EPA had misunderstood anything was when someone (Tom, Tim, or Erin might know who he was) said that there was a misunderstanding on page 2 of EPA's comments under Habitat Restoration. He said that the proposed habitat restoration is intended to offset 150 years of impacts to habitat, but has nothing to do with the water projects. I think that's a red herring and would not advise raising it as a follow up issue, but it is worth knowing that that perspective exists. While it may be true that the BDCP provides a mechanism for pursuing restoration activities that have long been desired, with or without the tunnels, the water projects are inextricably linked with habitat degradation, and habitat restoration is presented in the BDCP DEIS as a conservation measure to address the impacts of issuing a take permit for continued operation of the water projects.

- Kathy

Sent from my iPhone